

OUTER BELT OF FOREST PRESERVES AND PARKWAYS
FOR CHICAGO AND COOK COUNTY.

Address by President Henry G. Foreman
To the Outer Belt Park Commission,
Delivered on April 21, 1904.
Reprinted, by authority, from the
Official Proceedings of the County Board.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from



CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois



OUTER BELT OF FOREST PRESERVES AND PARKWAYS
FOR CHICAGO AND COOK COUNTY.

Address by President Henry G. Foreman
To the Outer Belt Park Commission,
Delivered on April 21, 1904.
Reprinted, by authority, from the
Official Proceedings of the County Board.

MEMBERS OF THE OUTER BELT PARK COMMISSION.

- Representing City and County..... {
MR. DANIEL H. BURNHAM,
MR. JOHN P. WILSON,
MR. JOHN J. MITCHELL,
MR. CHARLES L. HUTCHINSON,
JUDGE P. S. GROSSCUP,
MR. JOHN BARTON PAYNE,
DR. J. B. MURPHY,
MR. E. A. CUMMINGS,
MR. D. H. PERKINS,
MR. W. H. MILLER.
- Representing City of Chicago..... {
MAYOR CARTER H. HARRISON,
ALD. ERNST F. HERRMANN,
ALD. L. P. FRIESTEDT,
ALD. D. V. HAREIN,
ALD. J. J. BRADLEY,
- Representing South Park Commissioners..... {
COMMISSIONER LYMAN A. WALTON,
COMMISSIONER WILLIAM BEST,
COMMISSIONER JEFFERSON HODGKINS,
- Representing West Park Commissioners..... {
COMMISSIONER E. H. PETERS,
COMMISSIONER FRED A. BANGS,
COMMISSIONER G. J. NORDEN,
- Representing Lincoln Park Commissioners..... {
COMMISSIONER F. T. SIMMONS,
COMMISSIONER F. H. GANSBERGEN,
COMMISSIONER JAMES H. HIRSCH,
- Representing County Board..... {
COMMISSIONER A. C. BOEBER,
COMMISSIONER E. K. WALKER,
COMMISSIONER JOSEPH CAROLAN,
COMMISSIONER JOSEPH E. FLANAGAN,
PRESIDENT HENRY G. FOREMAN,

8 131/2

OUTER BELT PARK COMMISSION.

President Henry G. Foreman, of the County Board, recommended in a message submitted on August 3, 1903, that the Board authorize the appointment of an Outer Belt Park Commission.

On the same date the Board by resolution granted the authority for the appointment of a Commission of twenty-nine members to take up the matter of providing a satisfactory system of outlying preserves and connecting parkways and to do all things necessary to accomplish that end.

The numerical composition of the Commission was prescribed as follows: Ten citizens representing the city and the county, the Mayor of Chicago and four aldermen, three members of each park commission, and four members and the President of the County Board.

President Foreman on January 18, 1904, made the appointments and they were concurred in by the County Board.

At the first meeting of the Commission, held on April 21, 1904, Henry G. Foreman was chosen temporary chairman and William C. Graves, temporary secretary, and the chair was authorized to appoint a Committee on Organization, the chair to be a member thereof. A motion was passed that the County Board be requested to print the address of the president in pamphlet form for general distribution. The County Board on April 25 ordered the address so printed.

ADDRESS BY HENRY G. FOREMAN

PRESIDENT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF COOK COUNTY

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE OUTER BELT PARK COMMISSION

ON APRIL 21, 1904

CHICAGO, April 21, 1904.

*To the Honorable the Outer Belt Park Commission of the County of Cook
and the City of Chicago:*

Season of tree-
planting.

GENTLEMEN,— In calling this Commission to order it seems appropriate to refer to the season of tree planting, now at hand, for to-morrow is Arbor Day in Illinois. This is a fitting time to take up the work of preserving the forests which nature has made near Chicago as reservoirs of health, comfort and pleasure for the population of our great city.

Inspiration in
Arbor Day.

The fact that there is an Arbor Day in all American states, save one, argues eloquently for the preservation of grown trees. We should receive inspiration from a season set aside for work intimately associated with our special mission.

A Serious Problem.

Recreation area
for a great city.

But this mission looks far beyond the mere sentiment of staying the woodman's ax. It lays before us more than a problem in forestry, important as that in itself is. We are called upon to create a system of outlying preserves — wooded and open — for the use of a cosmopolitan population, living in a commercially strategic point, and destined, probably, to grow into the greatest assemblage of human beings on the Western hemisphere. Possibly Chicago some day will be the largest city in the world.

Conditions to be
ameliorated.

Facing the reasonable assurance of at least a much larger population than we have to-day, the problem of providing satisfactory outdoor recreation for the people of the greater city becomes indeed intricate and serious. It calls for careful thought. We must realize that unsatisfactory conditions demanding prompt attention for the health, contentment and happiness of

a restless, ambitious, crowding people are interwoven in the problem and must be met and ameliorated.

So, at the start, let us take a broad view of our task. Let us realize how grave a problem we face. Then let us soberly set about to solve it, remembering that we are working not merely for the present population — for ourselves and our children — but for future generations.

Work for future generations.

Chicago's Phenomenal Growth.

Chicago's phenomenal growth, I believe, warrants this commission in providing an extensive outer park area. To illustrate the relative magnitude of this growth I have gone back to 1830 and made decennial comparisons of the populations of four large American cities up to 1900, and carried the comparison on to 1903.

Decennial comparisons.

In 1830 New York had a population of 202,589, Chicago about forty persons, Philadelphia 161,410 and Boston 61,392. In 1903 New York had 3,716,139, Chicago 1,873,880, Philadelphia 1,367,716 and Boston 594,618. The figures for 1903 are the estimates of the Federal Census office and may be accepted as conservative.

Population figures.

The city directory estimates, which usually are made along generous lines, indicate the 1903 population in these four cities, as follows: New York, 3,583,930 (less than the Federal estimate); Chicago, 2,231,000; Philadelphia, 1,500,000 and Boston, 603,183.

From 1840, when Chicago was well established with a population of 4,470 (having been incorporated in 1837), to 1903 this city's percentage of increase in population, based on directory figures for 1903, was 49811. For the same period New York's percentage, similarly based as to 1903, was 1046, Philadelphia 581, and Boston 546. On the Federal estimate for 1903 Chicago's percentage of growth was 41754; New York's 1088; Philadelphia's 521 and Boston's 537.

Percentages of increase.

This is indeed a tremendous growth for Chicago even on the conservative Federal population estimate.

Lags Behind in Park Growth.

But, while Chicago from 1840 to 1903 has shown an enormous percentage of increase in population, has it made a proportionate increase in applied park facilities for its great population? Emphatically no.

Disproportionate increase.

In 1869 the act creating the present park system was passed by the General Assembly. By 1880 the ragged city system had been improved and increased till there were 2,000 acres. In 1880 Philadelphia led American cities in park area, having 2,819 acres. Chicago was second. New York was third with 1,007.25 and Boston had 233 acres. In 1903 Chicago, including authorized additions, had 3,174 acres; Philadelphia, 3,503 acres; New York, 8,074 acres and Boston 12,878 acres.

City comparisons in 1880.

Chicago during the period 1880-1903, using the Federal estimate for 1903, increased in population 272.40 per cent, but in park area increased only 58.70 per cent. For the same period Philadelphia increased 61.46 per cent in population and 24.26 per cent in park area; New York increased

Comparative percentage of increase.

208.07 per cent in population and 701.25 per cent in park area; and Boston increased 63.88 per cent in population and 5,427.0 per cent in park area.

Behind Boston and New York.

So, while Chicago has exceeded greatly the other three cities in population growth, it has fallen far behind Boston and New York in the percentage of park growth.

Chicago Parks and Those of Other Cities.

Broader comparison.

But to take up the comparison on a broader scale, I have made a careful investigation of recreation areas in the leading cities of the United States and have put the results into comparative tables, so that we may see at a glance how Chicago stands in regard to parks when placed side by side with other American cities.

Position in 1880.

The showing is not flattering to Chicago.

In 1880, eleven years after the present system of parks and boulevards was projected, this city, in the acre area of the system, stood, as stated, next to Philadelphia, which then had the largest acreage of parks of any city in the Union. At that time Chicago in population was fourth among the cities of the United States, being exceeded by New York, Philadelphia and Brooklyn. So in 1880 Chicago stood well in regard to parks.

Seventh place to-day.

But how does it stand to-day? While our city for some time has been second in population, in the acre area of its parks it has slipped back to seventh place among the cities of the United States.

Authorized additions included.

That we may put our best foot forward, I have included, in the Chicago total, additions now being made or authorized, to the system on the three sides of the city.

Here are the cities and the figures, collected from data furnished in 1903 by Park Boards in the various localities:

Park acreage of eight American cities.	City.	Acre Area of Parks.
1	Boston	12,878
2	New York	8,074
3	Los Angeles	3,737
4	Newark, New Jersey, and environs.....	3,548
5	Philadelphia	3,503
6	San Francisco	3,411
7	Chicago	3,174
8	Washington	2,911

Second in Miles of Boulevards.

Chicago next to New York.

These figures do not include boulevards. Chicago is the second city in this respect, having forty-eight miles of such drives, while New York is first with sixty-one miles. New Orleans has forty-one miles, Boston thirty-four miles and Minneapolis twenty-seven miles. Other cities have shorter systems.

Chicago in Test as to Usefulness.

Parks are for the people.

But, acreage of parks and miles of boulevards do not set a fair standard for measuring the effectiveness of open air recreation facilities. Parks are not made for cities. They are made for the people who live in cities. Parks are useful in their application to human needs.

Let us then make the crucial test of the utility of Chicago's park system as compared with the utility of systems in other localities. Let us figure the number of inhabitants to each acre of park in several American cities. Crucial test of utility.

For this comparison I wrote to the proper officials in nineteen cities known to have large park area. When the figures were received and tabulated Chicago was found at the bottom of the list—nineteenth—and eighth below the general average for all. Chicago at the end.

Here is the table with population on the basis of the Federal estimate for 1903:

City.	Inhabitants to each Acre of Park.	Inhabitants to park acre.
1 Meriden, Conn.	25.1	
2 Los Angeles, Cal.	31.6	
3 Lynn, Mass.	34.6	
4 Boston, Mass.	46.2	
5 Newark, N. J., Orange and E. Orange.	88.8	
6 St. Paul, Minn.	98.9	
7 Washington, D. C.	100.7	
8 San Francisco, Cal.	104.4	
9 Minneapolis, Minn.	131.5	
10 Omaha, Neb.	153.8	
11 Hartford, Conn.	160.3	
12 St. Louis, Mo.	280.5	
13 Providence, R. I.	324.1	
14 Detroit, Mich.	323.6	
15 Philadelphia, Pa.	390.1	
16 Baltimore, Md.	425.4	
17 New York	460.3	
18 New Orleans, La.	508.6	
19 Chicago	590.4	
Average of all	206.6	

Going a little deeper into this matter it was found that in a comparison with cities in the United States, of a population of 100,000 and upward, Chicago stood in the limelight as No. 32! Still worse for Chicago.

This certainly is a bad showing for the second city in population, the second city in miles of boulevards, the seventh city in park acreage, and, as some believe, the first city in destined greatness. Yet I believe most Chicago people would be surprised to learn that we do not possess the most effective park system in the United States. Certainly a bad showing.

Why is Chicago far Behind?

Having found by comparison that Chicago needs a much amplified park system, let us inquire why it is that comparatively little cities like Meriden, Connecticut, Lynn, Massachusetts, and Los Angeles, California, have more recreation area for each inhabitant than Chicago affords its population. Chicago needs shown.

This inquiry, gentlemen, brings us face to face with the reason why we are here to-day. Many of these cities have outlying park preserves. They have realized the need of country and forest recreation area and have provided it before the stress of an unsatisfied population was upon them. Others have outlying preserves.

Cities with Outlying Parks.

Of the nineteen American cities, listed in the foregoing table, which exceed Chicago in the matter of park area, the following already have outlying systems of the acreage indicated: Cities with outer parks.

	City or Locality.	Acres Outlying Parks.
1	Boston	9,935
2	Los Angeles	3,015
3	Newark, New Jersey, and environs.	2,500
4	San Francisco	2,000
5	Washington	1,775
6	New York	1,212
7	Meriden, Conn.	1,000
8	Lynn, Mass.	802
9	Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.	554

Records of Outer Park Work.

Boston, Essex county, Lynn, etc.

The records of the work done for outer parks in each of these localities have been procured for this Commission. I would call attention especially to the superb system Boston has created, to the notable development in Essex county, New Jersey, to the great woods of Lynn, Massachusetts, and to the mountain park of Meriden, Connecticut.

Localities planning outer parks.

The localities sustaining outer park systems have set a pace for other American cities. As a result the following municipalities are perfecting, or considering, plans for outer preserves and parkways.

Baltimore, Providence, Louisville, Seattle, Portland, Oregon; Fall River, Harrisburg, and Cook county, Illinois.

Work for New York.

While New York has no outer reservations under its government the palisades preserve is so near at hand that I have included it as a part of the New York system. The Essex county, New Jersey, parks also are near enough to be of service to the people of the Eastern metropolis, but they are treated separately.

Awake to recreation needs.

That New York recognizes the need of acquiring wooded land for recreation needs is shown in the report of the New York Commissioners of Parks for 1902, under the heading "Richmond County Parks," as follows:

"With the general idea of acquiring considerable areas of land for future development as public parks, attention has been drawn to the Borough of Richmond. Within the boundaries of Richmond County there are many tracts of land that could be acquired at a reasonable value and which are especially fitted for development as public parks. These tracts include some of the higher lands of the island, some very fine forest lands, and, in addition, the stretches of land along the seashore. The city of New York has been extremely backward in the development of public seaside parks."

Practical Benefits of Forests upon Populations.

Facts established by the Government.

While the public recognizes the practical value of forest preserves, perhaps this Commission desires information as to the provable benefits which wooded areas afford city populations. There are many popular beliefs regarding forests which are not provable, but some of the facts established by the experts in the employ of the United States government are:

That forests have a beneficial effect on local climate; that forests have a local effect on rain fall and upon vegetable growths, although as to rain fall this is disputed in Germany; that forest floors are regulators of local water flow, preventing alike flood and drouth, and also reducing the amount of wind-blown dust; that forests, like lakes, cause air to circulate; and that forest soil conditions are unfavorable to the existence of disease germs.

These facts, I think, show that forests are of practical value to large populations. All persons recognize their sentimental worth.

Sentimental value recognized.

Chicago Wakens to Its Park Needs.

I have shown by figures that our city is much behind the times in the matter of parks. However, there is evidence, in present activity, that we are rousing ourselves to our needs.

Present activity.

Until April, 1903, Chicago was restrained from locating new parks where the growth of the population required them, because the law prescribed that new parks could be created only contiguous to existing parks and boulevards. That law was amended by the last Legislature. A new era in local park building is the result.

Restricted by law.

The South Park Commissioners are creating new large and small parks, the West Chicago Park Commissioners have located sites for small parks, and the Commissioners of Lincoln Park are to add a large area to Lincoln Park and to buy land for small parks. The total added to the present Chicago system is more than nine hundred acres, making the park acreage of Chicago when work now under way, or contemplated, is completed, 3,174 acres. This, as stated, is the figure used in all the foregoing comparisons.

Expansion under new law.

I am inclined to believe that the Chicago intramural park system, with the additions now under way, will be large enough to supply park needs within the city, where much that is artificial must be introduced in public recreation areas. What is needed to supplement this system is the outer preserves of forest and meadowland unimproved by the art of man.

Outer areas needed.

Few of the residents of this flat and smoky city know that near at hand are tree-crowned hills and wooded valleys, and rivers and pure air.

Material at hand.

What we need to do is to acquire large tracts of these wooded lands, which nature has placed at our doors. Now this outlying property is cheap. Soon it will be dear. In a few years, so rapid is the growth of Chicago, city life will be extended into these reservoirs of health. Streets will be laid out. Sewers will be dug. Acres will be cut into building lots. Trees of priceless value will be hewn down or left to die from lack of water, for the sewers will act as subsoil drains.

Threatened with destruction.

In fact, the destruction of forest trees is in progress hereabouts to-day. Soon it will be too late to secure these tracts as wooded reservations. The art of man never can recreate a tangled forest, if the native trees have been cut away.

Now the time to act.

Boston Shows Folly of Delay.

A sample of the folly of delay is evidenced in the Boston movement. In the "History of the Boston Metropolitan Parks," published under authority of the Boston Commissioners, occur these paragraphs:

Lessons from the East.

"The Boston parks were examples of the practical and aesthetic needs of cities and towns about Boston, which were too short-sighted to provide open spaces for the future when land was cheap and plenty, and too poor and weak to provide them when land for recreation was costly but sorely needed.

Short-sighted municipalities.

"At the time of this movement certain picturesque tracts of wild land north of Boston . . . were threatened by the advance of building operations which promised in a short season to extend over the entire

Wild land threatened.

region. At the same period certain wild tracts south of Boston . . . were also in jeopardy at the hands of private owners. Although the public had no right in the territory, yet, when the people discovered that the beauty of these sylvan tracts was to suffer serious injury and that an enjoyment of one of the natural resources of the Boston district was to be taken from them, a popular outcry was aroused.

Easy to obtain results.

"This attitude of the community toward certain tracts of land and its favorable attitude toward parks in general will go far to explain the readiness with which a popular movement for metropolitan parks was begun and the ease with which its objects were attained."

City Life and Outdoor Recreation.

Problems of the city.

One of the great problems of the age is the problem of the city. Some of the best men in America are trying to solve it. They are the cause of the municipal awakening which is spreading over the country a purifying and uplifting influence. Among the problems of the city is the provision for adequate recreation for the people. This problem becomes serious in every large city.

Outdoor life essential.

It is a characteristic of the present strenuous generation of Americans that outdoor life and change of scene and occupation are recognized as essential to health and happiness and progress. This is evidenced by the love of athletics, by the popularity of country clubs, and by the exodus of the well-to-do from cities during the summer months.

Masses are trespassers in forest lands.

While outdoor life and change of scene and occupation are so essential, what has Chicago done to provide these blessings for the great majority of its cosmopolitan population, which, through lack of means, is unable to afford these essentials for itself and its posterity? In fact the great mass of our population to-day is a trespasser when it seeks an outing in near-by forest lands.

Chicago's Past and Prospective Growth.

Need of reservations.

That we may fully realize the need of country reservations for our population, let me revert to the growth of Chicago, the causes thereof and what within reason we may expect of the city.

Population now about 2,000,000

Chicago, as stated, is situated in a commercially strategic position. Early explorers recognized the site as favorable for a large city. Sixty-seven years ago Chicago had grown from a trading-post to an assemblage of 4,179 people and was incorporated as a city. In 1903 it had a population of 1,873,880 by Federal estimate, and by the city directory estimate 2,231,000. It is safe to fix the present population at about two million. There are men living here to-day who have witnessed this growth from the early thirties. There are men living here to-day who took part in the creation of our present park and boulevard system. They heard themselves ridiculed as dreamers. Their parks were in cabbage patches remote from population centers and street car service. To-day they look upon their dream work practically completed, but inadequate to the needs of the present population. Their so-called fanciful system is outgrown before it is finished. Is not this a forceful fact for us to consider in connection with our work?

Future population of 5,000,000.

It is impossible to forecast accurately the number of people who will make their home in Chicago ten, twenty and fifty years from now. But I

believe it conservative to state that in the not distant future our population will be at least 5,000,000. I advance this statement on the basis of the causes that have made Chicago the abode of about 2,000,000 persons within the span of a human life.

Chicago is the gateway to and from the West; and the great movement of commerce to-day is eastward and westward. Chicago lies also between the North and the South. It is the largest transportation center in the world, and the railroads have not come here because of free rights of way and tempting bonuses. They have come because Chicago is where it is. They were obliged to come, because the business they sought was here. They paid well to get into Chicago; and long ago they awoke to the need of outer belt lines and constructed them.

The gateway of commerce.

When the Panama canal is built commerce will be increased greatly north and south through Chicago. There is no accurate method of forecasting how important our city will become as a shipping center, both by rail and by water, with this added business to handle. There are great possibilities for Chicago as the commercially strategic point both east and west and north and south.

Growth as shipping center.

Chicago is convenient to timber belts. It is convenient to mines of iron and copper and coal. It is convenient to dairy lands. It is convenient to wheat and cornfields.

Raw material on hand.

Chicago will be not only the traffic center of the future America. Because of its location it also will be the manufacturing center. Raw material in increasing volume will be brought here to be worked over. Finished products in larger and larger quantities will be shipped hence to the marts of the world. The present enormous volume of this sort of business will seem small compared with that of the future; and other lines of human service will grow in proportion to the commercial and manufacturing development.

As a manufacturing center.

As sagacious a man as James J. Hill, reviewing the prospects of American trade with China, Japan and the American colonies, now in its infancy, said of the future Chicago:

J. J. Hill's prediction.

"When the Pacific Coast states shall have a population of 20,000,000, as they will, then Chicago will be the largest city in the world."

Problems of a Great Population.

While it seems clear that our destiny to be a very large city is assured by our position on the map, as evidenced by past growth, what of the tremendous local problems that will crowd themselves upon us for solution with the enormous and diversified population of the great Chicago of the future?

Destiny and its perplexities.

At present more than half of our people are foreign-born or born of foreign-born parents. Chicago is a city of workingmen. This always will be so. We have an extremely small so-called leisure class.

City of workingmen.

Bishop Charles P. Anderson, of the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Chicago, who is familiar with religious work among the city masses, said at the great missionary meeting in the Auditorium on January 7, 1903:

Words of Bishop Anderson.

Epitomizes missionary activity.

"I do not think there is a city in the United States that gathers up, as it were, into a single focus and epitomizes all the departments of missionary activity so much as our own metropolis. Over sixty of the world's races and nationalities live within our borders. Over fifty per cent of our people are of foreign birth."

Used to public recreation.

This is a population that by heredity is accustomed to recreation furnished by governments. By tradition, as well as by instinct, pleasant occupation out of working and sleeping hours is necessary for its physical and moral health, for its happiness and for its contentment.

Fate of many in cities.

The great bulk of the people, here as elsewhere, do not rise above financial mediocrity. Many do not attain to that. They are not able, as individuals, to provide means of recreation. This is true not only of the emigrant from foreign shores. It also is true of most of the people attracted from American rural life to the glitter and fascination of supposed city opportunity — of the misguided, who are hastening to cities, many to spend their lives, out of working hours, in life-sapping tenements and in the immoral influences of the street corners, saloons and dance houses.

Cause for alarm.

The movement from the country to the city is a cause for alarm. While the well-to-do, recognizing the need of pure air and change of scene for their health and contentment, are seeking country life, vastly greater numbers are leaving a natural existence to take up one that is artificial and baneful.

Causes of insanity.

It is not surprising that, impelled by the desperation of misery, many persons turn for solace to the use of alcohol and to pleasures which open the way to destruction. Liquor and the frequent result of these so-called pleasures are the two great causes of insanity. Is it to be wondered that our Hospital for the Insane at Dunning is greatly overcrowded to-day, and that Cook county's quotas in the State Hospitals are full?

Crime and a crowded jail.

It is not surprising, either, that many city people turn to crime, because of the irritating conditions surrounding them. The Cook County Jail is so overcrowded that our courts are blockaded with business.

The critical problem.

How are we then to occupy and satisfy this restrained, dissatisfied and restless population, when it is not at work or sleeping? How are we to ameliorate conditions which are fraught with danger? Here is a critical problem which our Commission can aid in solving. The government must supply the necessity which private individuals can not procure.

Crowning park work.

The park boards of Chicago are doing much now for the masses, but the crowning park work is to be done by our Commission. We are to provide the future Chicago with what will be one of its greatest blessings and one of its most needed safety appliances.

Material for Outer Reservations.

Ample material at hand.

Fortunately this Commission finds the material at hand ample for its needs. To the east we have Lake Michigan with its cool winds, its bluffs, and its natural bathing beaches. To the south are flats, lakes and a river. To the west is the hilly height of land between the basin of the great lakes and the valley of the Mississippi river. Beyond the height of land are the wooded valleys of rivers and creeks. To the north are marshlands and forest-topped bluffs.

From these bounteous provisions of nature we can create an outer system of preserves and connecting parkways that will prove pleasing in variety and that will be filled with objects of interest. All this is easily accessible by steam and electric roads at low fares.

Satisfactory system.

These lands should be left in their native state. They should receive no artificial park treatment. Residents of our crowded districts can enjoy the pleasures of camp life there. They can have boating. They can fish. They can bathe and swim. They can pick and eat the nuts and wild fruits. They can gather the flowers of the field and forest. They can see and hear the birds and other forms of wild animal life. They can be close to the heart of nature. They can find rest from their toil, and refreshment for work to come.

Pleasures of the country.

Above all, this outdoor area, when secured, will belong to the masses. The people will not be trespassers there, and the areas dedicated forever to them and their children will be vaster than any private individual, no matter how rich, could afford to purchase and maintain for private use.

Property of the people.

Formal Organization Recommended.

So this Commission, representing the entire population of Cook county, is committed to a great task, one that will require and deserve in its performance the best thought and most earnest endeavor of all its members.

Worthy of best thought.

To you is committed the work of outlining and securing the necessary legislation for the Outer Park district; of evolving plans for providing the necessary funds to create and maintain it; and of doing all other things necessary to provide our city, which seems destined to be the greatest on this continent, with recreation areas commensurate with its needs.

Work to be done.

That we may advance this movement with order and deliberation I would recommend that the Commission to-day, if its judgment approves, proceed to form a temporary organization with chairman and secretary, and appoint a committee to draft a plan for formal organization, such committee to report at a meeting to be called at an early date by the chairman of the said committee.

Organization.

Records of the Commission.

The official record of the creation of this Commission and of the appointment of the members thereof, and the data upon which this message was prepared, are preserved for the use of your honorable body.

Records preserved.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY G. FOREMAN,

President Board of Commissioners of Cook County.

STATISTICAL TABLES REGARDING THE POPULATION AND PARK AREAS OF CERTAIN CITIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

COMPARATIVE POPULATIONS OF FOUR LARGE AMERICAN CITIES, 1830 TO 1903, INCLUSIVE.

Year.	New York.	Chicago.	Philadelphia.	Boston.
1830.....	202,589	‡40	161,410	61,392
1840.....	312,710	‡4,470	220,423	93,383
1850.....	515,547	29,963	340,045	136,881
1860.....	805,658	109,260	569,529	177,840
1870.....	942,292	298,977	674,022	250,526
1880.....	1,206,299	503,185	847,170	362,839
1890.....	1,515,301	1,099,850	1,046,964	448,477
1900.....	3,437,202	1,698,575	1,293,697	560,892
*1903.....	3,716,139	1,873,880	1,367,716	594,618
*Pr. ct. increase 1840-1903. ...	1,088%	41,754%	521%	537%

(*) Census office basis of computing, i. e., "rests on assumption that the annual increase for each year since the last census will be one-tenth of the decennial increase between the last two censuses."

(†) Colbert's table (Andreas, Volume I, page 159) gives the estimated population in 1829 as 30, and in 1831 as 60. No estimate is made for 1830. The population for 1840 is also from Colbert's table.

NOTE.—In the Federal Census of 1850 is a table (page lii, Table XXXIV) of the "Comparative Population of thirty-two of the largest cities in the United States," Chicago is not in the list. On the same page is the comparative population of "fifty-six other cities and towns" for 1840 and 1850. Chicago is not even listed among the "other cities," although it was incorporated in 1837 and in 1850 had a population (Federal Census page CVIII) of 29,963. The first census taken in Chicago after its incorporation and in the same year (1837) showed a population of 4,170. (Andreas, Vol. I, page 179.)

Population figures, not otherwise specified, are taken from Federal Census reports.

COMPARATIVE TABLE FOR FOUR AMERICAN CITIES OF PARK AREAS AND THEIR INCREASE; ALSO PERCENTAGES
OF CHANGE OF ACREAGE AND POPULATION.

CITY.	Acre Area of Parks 1880.	Acre Area of Parks 1890.	Acre Area of Parks 1903.	Increase Acre Area 1880-1903.	Percentum increase		Percentum Change. *Number Inhabitants to Each Acre of Park 1880-1903.
					Park Area 1880-1903.	*Population 1880-1903.	
Philadelphia. . . .	2,819	3,025	3,503	684	24.26	61.46	Increase 29.93
Chicago.	2,000	2,006	3,174	1,174	58.70	272.40	" 134.66
New York	1,007.25	5,101	8,074	7,066.75	701.25	208.07	Decrease 61.57
Boston	233	1,130	12,878	12,645	5,427	63.88	" 97.03
Totals	6,059.25	11,262	27,629	21,569.75	356	158.68	" 43.28

*Basis.—Census office method computing 1903 population.

*NUMBER OF INHABITANTS TO EACH ACRE OF TOTAL PARK AREAS IN THE FOLLOWING 19 CITIES OF UNITED STATES.

1. Meriden, Conn	25.1
2. Los Angeles, Cal	31.6
3. Lynn, Mass.	34.6
4. Boston, Mass	46.2
5. Newark, Orange and East Orange, N. J.	88.8
6. St. Paul, Minn	98.9
7. Washington, D. C	100.7
8. San Francisco, Cal.	104.4
9. Minneapolis, Minn.	131.5
10. Omaha, Neb.	153.8
11. Hartford, Conn	160.3
<hr/>	
AVERAGE OF ALL 19 CITIES	206.6
<hr/>	
12. St. Louis, Mo	280.5
13. Providence, R. I	324.1
14. Detroit, Mich	325.6
15. Philadelphia, Pa	390.4
16. Baltimore, Md	425.4
17. New York, N. Y	460.3
18. New Orleans, La	508.6
19. Chicago, Ill.	590.4

*On basis of population computed for 1903 on Census office method.

CHICAGO—ANALYSIS OF PARK AREAS.

	Present Areas				Areas Being Acquired.				Totals.			
	Large Parks.	Small Parks.	Boulevards.	Water.	Large Parks.	Small Parks.	Boulevards.	Water.	Large Parks.	Small Parks.	Boulevards.	Water.
	Acres.	Acres.	Miles.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Miles.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Miles.	Acres.
SOUTH PARK.												
Authorities; 1902 report, page 19.	1,215.66		17.28	119.29					1,865.01	11.52	17.28	119.29
Blue Print, March, 1904.					649.35	11.52						
LINCOLN PARK.												
Authorities; 8-12-03 letter Sec'y Warder. City Council proceedings 2-1-04, page 2156-7.	308.07	18.62	7	57.72					523.07	29.72	7	57.72
WEST PARK.												
Authorities; 8-12-03 letter Sec'y Fieldhouse.	592.76	21.65	23.144	60					592.76	21.65	23.144	60
Recommended by Special Park Commission						28						
CITY PARKS.												
Authority; Municipal Library Statistics, July, 1903.		102										
Totals	2,116.40	147.27	47.424	237.01	864.35	50.62			2,980.84	192.89	47.424	237.01

COMPARATIVE TABLE SHOWING CERTAIN DATA RELATING TO PARKS IN NINETEEN CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

(Compiled from Documents and Papers Received from Respective City or Park Authorities.)

No.	City or Locality.	Population.		Park Areas—1903.				Population Per Acre.			Boulevards and Drives			Water Areas in Parks included in Foregoing.	Controlling Bodies.
		Estimated from 1903 Directories.	1903 by Census Office Method of Computing. See Foot-note.	City Parks Over 10 Acres Each.	City Parks Under 10 Acres Each.	Reservations Outlying.	Total.	Direct-mate Basis.		City Boulevards.	Outside.		Acres.		
								Direct-mate Basis.	Office Estimate.		Miles.	Drives Connecting Reservations.			
1	Baltimore, Md.	650,000	531,313	1,188	61	1,249	951	520.4	425.4	4	4	100	City; Department of Park Commissioners. Reservations, by Park Board, appointed by Governor; Common, Public Garden and City Square, by Superintendent of Public Grounds; other city parks by City Board of Park Commissioners.		
2	Boston, Mass.	603,183	594,618	2,791	152	9,985	12,878	46.8	46.2	12	22	419			
3	Detroit, Mich.	350,000	309,653	879	72	879	951	388.1	325.6	10	13	73	Commission appointed by Mayor.		
4	Hartford, Conn.	80,000	87,836	540	8	548	146.0	160.3	3	3	46	Commission appointed by Mayor.			
5	Los Angeles, Cal.	135,000	118,104	714	8	3,015	8,737	36.1	31.6	8	8		46	Park Commissioners.	
6	Lynn, Mass.	127,348	1,279	12	802	2,093	34.6	34.6	8	8	27	Reservations maintained by Mr. Walter Hubbard, its donor.			
7	Minneapolis, Minn.	250,000	214,112	1,150	44	1,628	1,628	153.6	131.5	27	27		450		
8	Meriden, Conn.	25,089	25,089	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	25.1	25.1	41	41	10	Park Commissioners of Essex County appointed by Chief Justices.		
9	New Orleans, La.	300,000	300,625	524	56	11	591	507.6	508.6	3	3	10			
10	Newark, Orange & E. Orange, N. J.	315,165	315,165	1,048	2,500	3,548	88.8	88.8	61	61	403	City Department of Parks.			
11	New York, N. Y.	3,583,930	3,716,130	6,642	220	*1,212	8,074	443.9	460.3	7	7		403		
12	Omaha, Neb.	91,186	91,186	573	20	593	153.8	153.8	390.4	390.4	2	130	Fairmont Park Commissioners appointed by Courts and Council; other Squares by Bureau of Public Property.		
13	Philadelphia, Pa.	1,500,000	1,387,716	3,384	119	3,503	3,503	427.8	390.4	5	5	36			
14	Providence, R. I.	180,000	188,682	561	21	582	309.3	324.1	324.1	2	2	130	Three Commissioners elected by City Council. Park Commissioners; Board of Public Works; United States Government.		
15	San Francisco, Cal.	400,000	355,919	1,321	90	2,000	3,411	117.3	104.4	10	5	36			
16	St. Louis, Mo.	700,000	612,279	2,147	36	2,183	320.3	280.5	280.5	2	2	3	Park Department—City of St. Louis.		
17	St. Paul, Minn.	172,038	172,038	1,461	159	120	1,740	103.4	98.9	5	5	538			
18	Washington, D. C.	293,217	293,217	1,022	114	1,775	42,911	100.7	100.7	48	48	237	City Parks, Chief of Engineers, U. S. A.; Outlying, Park Commissioners and National Museum.		
19	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS	2,231,000	1,873,880	2,081	193	43,174	702.9	590.4	590.4	48	48	237			
		Totals, with averages.		30,205	1,385	22,804	54,394	206.6	206.6	243	27	270	2,578	Commissioners appointed by Governor or Judges.	

NOTE.—Census method of computing population rests "on the assumption that the annual increase for each year since the last census will be one-tenth of the decennial increase between the last two censuses."

‡Includes new parks recently purchased.

†Area exclusive of Soldier's Home.

*Is the Palisades Reservation, not under the control of the New York City Department of Parks.

SD
428
I3
F67
1904
RARE
BK RM

Officers and Committees

(SELECTED JULY 12, 1904)

President	HENRY G. FOREMAN
Vice-President	DANIEL H. BURNHAM
Second Vice-President	ERNST F. HERRMANN
Treasurer	JOHN J. MITCHELL
Auditor	WILLIAM BEST
Secretary	WILLIAM C. GRAVES

Executive Committee

E. A. CUMMINGS	CARTER H. HARRISON
CHARLES L. HUTCHINSON	DANIEL H. BURNHAM
WILLIAM BEST	

Committee of Ways and Means

LYMAN A. WALTON	JOHN J. MITCHELL
JEFFERSON HODGKINS	EDWIN K. WALKER
FRANCIS T. SIMMONS	

Committee on Legislation

FREDERICK H. GANSBERGEN	PETER S. GROSSCUP
JOHN P. WILSON	JOHN BARTON PAYNE
FRED A. BANGS	ERNST F. HERRMANN
JOSEPH E. FLANAGAN	

Committee on Plans

DANIEL H. BURNHAM	DWIGHT H. PERKINS
WILLIAM BEST	E. A. CUMMINGS
AUGUST C. BOEBER	

Committee on County, City and Park Relations

JOHN J. BRADLEY	JOSEPH CAROLAN
JAMES H. HIRSCH	EDWARD H. PETERS
LUTHER P. FRIESTEDT	

Committee on Rules

DR. JOHN B. MURPHY	LYMAN A. WALTON
WILLIAM H. MILLER	DANIEL V. HARKIN
DWIGHT H. PERKINS	